



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,584	06/29/2001	Robert S. DeWitte	426.97.265	3885
23483	7590	10/08/2003	EXAMINER	
HALE AND DORR, LLP			LY, CHEYNE D	
60 STATE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02109			1631	

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/897,584

Applicant(s)

DEWITTE ET AL.

Examiner

Cheyne D Ly

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' arguments filed August 08, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.
2. The new title has been accepted.
3. Claims 1-4 are examined on the merits.

Priority

4. In order for the present application to receive benefit of priority for an invention to an earlier application, the earlier application (parent or provisional) must disclose the invention so as to be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 regarding said invention. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ 2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994). The specific claimed subject matter of the present application was not disclosed in the priority document (Application Number 08/741,866). Therefore, domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 has not been granted for the presently claimed subject matter.

1. It is noted that the instant application complies with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 regarding said invention as directed to U.S. Serial No. 09/220,363 filed December 24, 1998. Therefore, domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 has been granted for the presently claimed subject matter.

LACK OF ENABLEMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Art Unit: 1631

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for de novo design of molecules that interact with receptor sites of Src-homology-3 domain, Src-homology-2 domain, MDM2 protein, CD4 protein, or human carbonic anhydrase II protein, does not reasonably provide enablement for de novo design of molecules that interact with any receptor. Further, the instant specification is not enabling for the de novo design of any molecule to interact with any receptor site. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

7. This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 1-4 as recited in the previous office action mailed May 12, 2003.

Response to Applicant's argument

8. Applicant argues that the language set forth in the instant specification (page 17, lines 11-14 and 59, lines 7-10) does not limit the claimed invention wherein the scope enablement is limited to the de novo design of molecules that interact with receptor sites of Src-homology-3 domain, Src-homology-2 domain, MDM2 protein, CD4 protein, or human carbonic anhydrase II protein. Further, one of skill in the art would be able to practice the claimed invention without undue experimentation because one of skill in the art would understand the contributions of the parts of the crystalline structure to binding free energy. Applicant's argument has been fully considered and found to be unpersuasive due to the limiting

Art Unit: 1631

guidance provided via working examples for a method that relies on data (binding free energy) derived from a method directed to an unpredictable art, protein crystallization. Therefore, the instant application provide adequate guidance to one of skill in the art to practice said invention as directed to Src-homology-3 domain, Src-homology-2 domain, MDM2 protein, CD4 protein, or human carbonic anhydrase II protein; however, one of skill in the art would not be able practice said invention with any other protein without undue experimentation as discussed below.

9. Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized in *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986) and reiterated by the Court of Appeals in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 at 1404 (CAFC 1988). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. The Board also stated that although the level of skill in molecular biology is high, the results of experiments in genetic engineering are unpredictable. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient amount for a *prima facie* case is discussed below.

10. Applicant discloses information present in crystal structures of proteins and crystal structures of protein-ligand may be used for predicting binding free energy which is necessary for the method of the claimed invention (Page 22, lines 19-22 to page 23, lines 1-4). It is acknowledged that the applicants have disclosed information to enable one skilled in

Art Unit: 1631

the art to calculate the binding free energy for the molecules that interact with receptor sites of Src-homology-3 domain, Src-homology-2 domain, MDM2 protein, CD4 protein, or human carbonic anhydrase II protein (Example 2, pages 56-79).

11. However, it is well documented that protein crystallization is in essence a trial-and-error method, and the results are usually unpredictable (Drenth, J.). Further, as recently as November 1, 2002, Science published a New Focus article depicting the current state of the art for protein crystallization that supports the unpredictability of the art. In essences, protein crystallization is still a trial and error process because the current technology for producing protein for the crystallization process is unpredictable, which results in high failure rate for proteins that are being crystallized. Therefore, researchers continue to have trouble generating sufficient protein required for the crystallization process (New Focus, Science, 2002). In light of the difficulty of the protein crystallization process, it is, therefore, unreasonable to expect one skilled in the art to use the method that relies on data that was derived from an unpredictable process such as protein crystallization for de novo molecule design of that interacts with any receptor site without undue experimentation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

13. Claims 1, 3, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly by anticipated by DeLisi et al. (US 5,495,423 A).

Art Unit: 1631

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

14. This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 1, 3, and 4 as recited in the previous office action mailed May 12, 2003.

15. Applicant argues by amendment that Delisi et al. does not disclose the building of second-generation molecules from one or more functional groups of high-ranking molecules of the first collection. Applicant's argument has been found to be unpersuasive due to the disclosure wherein the method of Delisi et al. comprises retrieving previously established low-energy amino acid (highest ranking), selecting a ligand anchor pair from among the low-energy amino acid configurations (second-generation molecules) (column 3, lines 8-13).

16. It is re-iterated Delisi et al. discloses a method of drug design. The factors that contribute to the said design process are surface complementary, ...electrostatic interaction energy, and solvation free energy (column 1, lines 39-44). In designing a peptide to bind to a receptor site, a peptide is docked to the receptor, each amino acid is placed in various orientations at each grid point, calculate the electrostatic interaction energy, those low-energy positions are selected, rank the positions according to the minimized energies, the backbone between the terminal anchor residues is filled in, and the peptide is manufactured (Column 5, lines 22-65 to column 6, lines 3-27), as in claim 1, steps (a)-(c). The minimum energy locations for the charged end-residue is determined using a multi-copy mean-field energy minimization algorithm. A multi-copy mean-field approximation algorithm has been written as a modification of the software CHARMM Molecular modeling is performed with software ECEPP (Empirical Conformational Energy Program for Peptides, from Indiana University) (Column 10, lines 66-67 to column 11, lines 1-15), as in claims 1, step (d)-(g), 3 and 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

19. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLisi et al. (US 5,495,423 A) in view of In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

20. This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 1-4 as recited in the previous office action mailed May 12, 2003.

21. Applicant argues by amendment that Delisi et al. does not disclose the building of second-generation molecules from one or more functional groups of high-ranking molecules of the first collection. Applicant's argument has been found to be unpersuasive as discussed above.

22. DeLisi et al. discloses the limitations directed toward claim 1 as cited above. Even though the method disclosed by Delisi et al. does not specify that the receptor site is a Src-homolgy-2 domain, the specific limitations of Src-homolgy-2 (SH2) domain in this instant case do not distinguish the invention from the prior art in term of patentability because they are descriptive nonfunctional subject matter.

23. In re Gulack defines nonfunctional descriptive material, as when descriptive material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in term of patentability. Also, the MPEP indicates that descriptive material that cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition (MPEP § 2106 (IV)(B)(b)). Specific to the instant case, the method of de novo designing molecules merely process the data directed toward the Src-homolgy-2 domain without creating any functional interrelationship, either as part of the stored data or as part active steps of the said method, then such descriptive material alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured, or to the computer.

24. Delisi et al. discloses an improvement for computing efficiency as directed to drug design strategies (column 1, lines 55 to column 2, lines 2) wherein data is derived from 3D molecular models (column 5, lines 55-65).

25. An artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention would have been motivated to partake the improvement suggested by DeLisi et al. for designing de novo molecules based on free energy. Further, the specific limitation of a SH2 domain is regarded as nonfunctional descriptive material as defined by In re Gulack. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the crystal structure data for the SH2 domain in the method of DeLisi et al. for designing de novo molecules based on free energy.

26. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLisi et al. (US 5,495,423 A) in view Hatada et al. (US 6251620 B1).

27. This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 1-4 as recited in the previous office action mailed May 12, 2003.

28. DeLisi et al. discloses the limitations directed toward claim 1 as cited above.

29. However, Delisi et al. does not specify that the receptor site is a Src-homolgy-2 domain.

30. Hatada et al. discloses that the three-dimensional structures of SH2 domain protein have been determined by X-ray crystallography (Abstract).

31. Delisi et al. discloses an improvement for computing efficiency as directed to drug design strategies (column 1, lines 55 to column 2, lines 2) wherein data is derived from 3D molecular models (column 5, lines 55-65).

32. An artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention would have been motivated to partake the improvement suggested by DeLisi et al. for designing de novo molecules based on free energy; and improve on the said method by using the X-ray crystal coordinates of SH2 disclosed by Hatada et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the crystal structure data for the SH2 domain as taught by Hatada et al. in the method of DeLisi et al. for designing de novo molecules based on free energy.

CONCLUSION

33. NO CLAIM IS ALLOWED.

34. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

35. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

36. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014.

37. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Dune Ly, whose telephone number is (703) 308-3880. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

Art Unit: 1631

38. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

39. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instruments Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3524 or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

C. Dune Ly
10/2/03


ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER